Hawaiian history and American history: integration or separation?

Tom Smith

Faculty of History, University of Cambridge, UK

tds33@cam.ac.uk; Twitter: @TomEtesonSmith

Tom Smith is a PhD candidate in history at the University of Cambridge. He has recently completed a dissertation entitled 'Protestant Mission, American Empire, and the Uses of History in Hawai'i and the Philippines, c. 1880-1930'. This considers how missionaries made use of history to justify and contextualize the American missionary and imperial presence in the Pacific, generating knowledge about other peoples to bolster U.S. authority. At the same time, however, it shows that missionaries' historical narratives reflected their differing relationships with religious ideals, American power, and indigenous knowledge in each setting, thus betraying U.S. empire's incoherence and malleability when faced with the cultures it sought to dominate.

Word count (main text plus endnotes and bibliography): 10,315

Hawaiian history and American history: integration or separation?

Over the past three decades, a rich historiography on nineteenth-century Hawai‘i has argued that too often the islands have been understood as marginal, and their people as passive in the face of American colonialism. This literature recovers the voices of the colonized, stressing the crucial ways in which Hawaiian history is *not* American history, but rather that of an independent people whose politics and culture were eroded by imperialism. This article offers an overview of this scholarship, asking how it might help scholars of U.S. history understand Hawai‘i as offering a different perspective for viewing the United States, from the outside in.

Keywords: Hawai‘i; Pacific Ocean; colonialism; indigeneity

Most Americans, argues the Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani-Kay Trask, “have come…to believe that Hawai‘i is as American as hot dogs and CNN.”[1] They are surprised to learn that “despite American political and territorial control of Hawai‘i since 1898, Hawaiians are not Americans.” Rather, they are “the children of Papa – earth mother – and Wākea – sky father – who created the sacred lands of Hawai‘i.”[2] From Trask’s perspective, to imagine an American Hawai‘i, a “militouristic” outpost of the United States ready to receive its paradise-seekers and military paraphernalia, is to partake in the islands’ colonization.[3]

The notion that we should divorce Hawai‘i from the image of the archipelago familiar to Americans has been a guiding principle in nineteenth-century Hawaiian historiography for the last three decades. This historiography recovers Native Hawaiian voices and places Hawaiians centrally, insisting that Hawaiian history is not American history but rather a story of contesting colonialism, innovating against overwhelming odds, and sustaining a way of life. It reads as a manifesto for a resurgent resistance since the 1960s to ongoing occupation in the guise of U.S. statehood: Hawaiians are not

"happy Natives," grateful for the coming of the United States to their islands, and nineteenth-century history demonstrates that they never were.[4]

Therefore, American historians must tread carefully when thinking about how Hawaiian history informs their work. On the one hand, American historiography might usefully engage Hawaiian history, as analyses of U.S. interactions with the islands over two hundred years offer perspectives on empire, race, law, governance, religion, gender, and indigeneity. On the other, Hawai‘i has a history in its own right. Its incorporation into the United States was not pre-determined, and Native Hawaiians were never silent about colonial incursions. Not least, they were self-governing by virtue of a monarchy with a written constitution and a network of diplomatic relationships with other nations. Moreover, they were highly literate, and their written record shows that they continued to imagine themselves not as peripheral to the United States, but as central within a dynamic oceanic world.

This article reviews the history and historiography of nineteenth-century Hawai‘i, focusing on how Hawaiian scholars resist perceptions of the islands as essentially American. They address important questions about the responsibilities of historians, the sources they use, and the limits of their understanding, and in some cases express skepticism that outsiders can ever do justice to the Hawaiian story through historical writing. The article also shows, however, that American historians can learn from Hawaiian history if they humbly and sensitively respond to Hawaiian historiography. By viewing Hawaiian history not as a marginal subfield of U.S. history, but as presenting an opportunity to radically decenter the United States, we begin to understand its specificity and importance.

Nineteenth-century Hawaiian history: an overview

Outside interest in the Hawaiian Islands was sparked by their "discovery" by the famed British explorer Captain James Cook in 1778. Tales from Cook's voyages told Europeans and Americans of sex and danger in the Pacific, and Hawai'i retained a particular mystique as the site where Cook was killed in 1779.[5] Cook's travels also revealed that the Pacific promised profit, and by the early nineteenth century Hawai'i had become central within a trans-Pacific trading world in which Americans were prominent, first as a way station for fur traders and whalers, then as a source of sandalwood for trade in Canton.[6] With explorers and traders came not only unsustainable resource exploitation, but also disease – venereal disease, and lethal outbreaks of measles, smallpox, typhoid fever, and leprosy, amongst others, across the century.[7] The Native Hawaiian population declined from perhaps 400,000 upon Cook's arrival to just 40,000 by the 1890s.[8] Imported weaponry, too, transformed the sociopolitical landscape. Shortly after Cook's visits, the chief Kamehameha embarked upon a military campaign to unify the Hawaiian island group and its chiefdoms under a single monarchy, a process completed by 1809.[9]

The presence of a strong central government shaped outsiders' perceptions of Hawai'i across the nineteenth century. The monarchy became the focal point for American Protestant missionaries, who first arrived in 1820. They found upon landing that Ka'ahumanu and Keōpūolani, wives of the late Kamehameha who had become queens regent ruling alongside his son and successor Liholiho, or Kamehameha II (r. 1819-1824), had a year earlier overthrown the *'ai kapu* – the sacred system regulating Hawaiian life and the relationship between Native Hawaiians, the land, and the gods. Missionaries took advantage of this perceived spiritual vacuum, and by the middle of the nineteenth century appeared to have been successful in creating a highly literate

Christian population.[10] Moreover, by gaining the trust of the Hawaiian monarchs, they influenced political affairs, especially during the reign of Kauikeaouli, or Kamehameha III (r. 1825-1854).[11] In 1840, Hawai‘i acquired a written constitution, establishing a government on Christian principles, for the first time abstracted from the person of the king and chiefs.[12] Then, in 1848, came the Māhele, a land reform which transformed traditional Hawaiian understandings of a reciprocal relationship between the people and the land, and initiated private land ownership.[13]

The existence of a single, constitutional monarchy helped Hawai‘i maintain its independence as imperial vultures circled. Kauikeaouli conducted effective diplomacy, and the independence of the islands was formally recognized by U.S. president John Tyler in December 1842, and by Britain and France in November 1843.[14] Other innovations, however, were detrimental. The Māhele facilitated the shift to a sugar plantation economy, forcing Native Hawaiians from their land and encouraging the rise of a class of wealthy *haole* (foreign) businessmen, mostly from America. It furthermore necessitated the importation of plantation labor, especially from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and the Portuguese empire, leading to dramatic demographic changes across the second half of the nineteenth century.[15]

As Hawaiian monarchs in the late nineteenth century reinvigorated Native Hawaiian culture and claimed greater executive power, for example through a new constitution in 1864, the *haole* planters who now dominated the islands' economy, prominent among whom were the children of American missionaries, formed an increasingly potent and antagonistic lobby.[16] In 1875, they influenced the king, Kalākaua (r. 1874-1891), to secure a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, allowing Hawai‘i privileged access to the U.S. market.[17] Such gains were unstable, however, requiring frequent treaty renewals and remaining subject to changes in U.S.

tariff policy, thus explaining why annexation by the United States became desirable to this dominant class.[18] At the same time, ongoing attempts by Kalākaua and his successor Queen Liliʻuokalani (r. 1891-1893) to temper *haole* influence frustrated these businessmen, and they took drastic action. In 1887, a secret *haole* society calling itself the "Hawaiian League" imposed the infamous "Bayonet Constitution" upon Kalākaua.[19] When this still did not curb monarchical power to the desired extent, an alleged attempt to impose a new constitution by Liliʻuokalani in January 1893 was taken as the League's cue to form a "Committee of Safety" and, colluding with the U.S. minister to Hawaiʻi and troops aboard the *U.S.S. Boston* in Honolulu harbor, to overthrow the indigenous monarchy.[20]

Liliʻuokalani appealed to President Grover Cleveland. He sent a commission to the islands, which supported the queen's assessment that her overthrow had been illegal. However, Cleveland's opposition went no farther than ordering the lowering of the U.S. flag, and though there was no immediate annexation as hoped for by the *haole* perpetrators of the overthrow, they declared a Republic of Hawaiʻi on July 4th, 1894, with missionary son Sanford Dole as its president.[21] When the time was ripe, under expansionist president William McKinley, and with fears abounding that European or Japanese designs upon Hawaiʻi might undercut America's Pacific vision, the islands were annexed by the United States in July 1898.[22]

Given that this is where the nineteenth-century story ends, and that Hawaiʻi became America's fiftieth state in 1959, it would be easy to figure nineteenth-century history as a story of how Hawaiʻi became American. However, this history displays significant contingency and contestation. As Sally Engle Merry has succinctly noted, Americans in the islands operated within a "deeply fractured" cultural field: the presence of European, Asian, and especially Native Hawaiian populations rendered U.S.

hegemony anything but inevitable.[23] Consequently, we see immediate problems with thinking of Hawaiian history as American history.

Colonial perspectives in scholarly histories

Before the 1990s, nineteenth-century Hawai‘i found its way into scholarly literature through the agency of outsiders writing detailed political histories. Casting the longest shadow was the California-born historian Ralph Simpson Kuykendall, who emigrated to Hawai‘i in 1922 to lead the Hawaiian Historical Commission, and shortly after became a professor at the University of Hawai‘i. Kuykendall's most famous work was *The Hawaiian Kingdom*, three volumes covering the years from Cook's arrival to the overthrow of the monarchy, published in 1938, 1953, and 1967.[24] A more concise overview, *Shoal of Time*, was published by Australian immigrant Gavan Daws in 1968, taking the story from Cook to Hawaiian statehood in 1959.[25] It would be overly simplistic to suggest that these authors simply folded Hawaiian history into American history. Hawaiian elites and inter-imperial competition were conspicuous in their narratives, indicative of the fractured cultural field described by Merry. Nonetheless, their histories foregrounded outsiders, and relied principally upon English-language sources which had a pro-annexation agenda and "sought to highlight American connections, interests, and influence," thus "support[ing] the narrative of Hawai‘i as an American place."[26]

Because they used English-language texts and ignored Native Hawaiian sources, Kuykendall and Daws replicated the views of Europeans and Americans about the islands' indigenous people. Lydia Kualapai pushes back against Kuykendall's construction of Lili‘uokalani as a despotic ruler whose actions justified her overthrow – a characterization transplanted into the historiography directly from sources produced

by Hawai‘i’s colonizers.[27] David Chang, meanwhile, criticizes Kuykendall and Daws for echoing Cook’s description of his discovery of the islands, portraying Hawaiians as passive recipients of foreign initiatives, rather than agents within a cultural exchange.[28] This Cook-centrism, says Houston Wood, plagued a number of twentieth-century scholars “supposedly interested in Hawaiians.”[29]

Above all, ignorance of Native Hawaiian voices created the impression that Hawaiians remained passive in the face of U.S. colonialism or, in Daws’ words, that their resistance was “feeble.”[30] From the suggestion that Hawaiians responded passively to colonization, it was not too great a leap to infer that they had consented to their absorption into American history. In turn, the notion of consensual colonization, argues Adria Imada, reified the twentieth-century U.S. tourist industry’s image of Hawaiian hospitality, and of Hawaiians’ readiness to extend *aloha* (roughly translated as “love”) to Americans.[31] Historians did not have to explicitly celebrate colonialism in order to facilitate it: the illusion of “easy accommodation” upheld colonial fantasies.[32] By implying that Hawaiian history was forged through unilateral American action, historians, in Kealani Cook’s words, “served up little more than apologetics for American imperial expansion.”[33]

The reproduction of colonial perspectives in histories written by non-natives led Trask to doubt whether Native Hawaiians could ever be represented through written histories. In *From a Native Daughter* (first published 1992), she denounced historians as “part of the colonizing horde,” who imposed upon the Hawaiian past a “linear, progressive conception of history” characterized by “an assumption that Euro-American culture flourishes at the upper end of that progression.”[34] Naming Kuykendall and Daws as egregious examples, Trask observed that, in written histories, she was “reading the West’s view of itself,” and suggested that historians who truly desired to know

Hawaiian history must eschew narratives "written in long volumes by foreign people," and instead "put down their books, and take up our practices."[35]

Trask's arguments reveal that at the heart of debates within Hawaiian historiography is a question about the nature of knowledge. Native Hawaiians traditionally have not understood their past through narratives fixed in writing and derived from written sources. Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa's pioneering scholarship in the 1990s argued that "in the Pacific there are at least two distinct realities from which any event can be viewed," and that to understand the ways in which Hawaiians see the past, we must look to their genealogies.[36] These were orally transmitted, taking the form of epic poems composed, memorized, and recited by specialists, usually employed by a particular chief. [37] They connected Hawaiians not only to their ancestors, but to the land and to cosmogony, emphasizing that "every aspect of the world…is related by birth" and asserting a cultural continuity long predating any *haole* engagements.[38] Genealogies were dynamic and heavily politicized, "contingent rather than absolute" in J. Kēhaulani Kauanui's words, with the genealogist's role being to make a convincing case for a chief's status through skillful composition and recitation.[39] Ultimately, argues Judy Rohrer, genealogies show how "through an indigenous lens, the islands exist outside Western conceptions of static space and linear time."[40] In this sense, the act of imagining Hawaiian history as American history is complicit in what Rohrer identifies as colonialism's project to suppress alternative epistemologies while producing its own versions of knowledge.[41]

Recovering Hawaiian voices

Nonetheless, since Kame'eleihiwa and Trask wrote, Hawaiian historiography has made the case that written histories and sources will not inevitably replicate colonial bias.

This argument, of course, does not signify an acceptance of Hawaiian history as American history, but it does open a terrain upon which Hawaiian and American historiographies can speak to one another. Whereas in the Native North American context ignorance of indigenous voices might be explained by a paucity of available written sources, this is not true in the Hawaiian case. There were nearly one hundred Hawaiian-language newspapers in circulation across the nineteenth century, and over the past two decades historians have utilized these and other sources to reframe nineteenth-century Hawaiian history.[42] Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* (2004) argues that Hawaiian-language writings from the second half of the nineteenth century, not only newspapers but also anti-annexation petitions and printed genealogies, demonstrate a conspicuous, rich, and dynamic culture of widespread indigenous resistance to American hegemony.[43] Because these sources had been largely ignored, especially after English was made the sole language of school instruction in 1896, Silva's research methodology was "simply to read what the Kanaka Maoli [Native Hawaiians] wrote."[44] This, she argues in her most recent work, is the route to constructing a Native Hawaiian intellectual history, something which Marie Alohalani Brown has also done through her study of the nineteenth-century Hawaiian author John Papa ʻĪʻī.[45]

For much of the twentieth century, if historians believed themselves to be recovering Native Hawaiian voices, they did so through a small corpus of works translated into English. Prominent within this canon were translations of nineteenth-century Hawaiian scholars, not only ʻĪʻī but also David Malo and Samuel Kamakau, two men who collected and recorded information about the Hawaiian past at the behest of American Protestant missionary Sheldon Dibble in the 1830s.[46] While historians of Hawaiʻi in the 1970s celebrated this work as showing Pacific Islanders writing their own histories, recent scholars have been more critical.[47] Several suggest that Malo and

Kamakau imbibed European and American notions of historical writing through their missionary educations, causing them to denigrate indigenous modes of understanding the past.[48] More fundamentally, Puakea Nogelmeier argues that we cannot recover indigenous voices from translations of nineteenth-century Hawaiian historians. Such translations took source material out of context and reordered it to such an extent that they only represent outsiders' attempts to express Hawaiian knowledge in a form that Wood describes as "monorhetorical," reducing it to "a linear, irreversible history associated with visible phenomena."[49] Nogelmeier thus encourages greater use of Hawaiian-language newspapers, which not only preserve linguistic subtleties effaced in translation but also better reflect Hawaiians' "polyrhetorical" understandings – their ability, in Wood's words, to encapsulate "multiple, shifting, and context-specific meanings" – by replicating the culture of dialogue and peer response which characterized oral tradition.[50]

Indeed, ever since the nineteenth century, Native Hawaiians have sought to inscribe "polyrhetorical" historical understandings within the "monorhetorical" written word: their best strategy for countering empire has been to write because, in Wood's words, "traditional practices *by themselves* are not oppositional to the dominant culture."[51] Kualapai argues that this is exactly what Lili'uokalani did in her influential English-language work *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen* (1898). Using the memoir form, she both foregrounded genealogical connection and produced a historical account of the events leading up to annexation for an American audience. She rendered her argument intelligible to Americans to whom she hoped to convey the injustice of her overthrow, while also asserting cultural distance through *kaona* (hidden meaning) and untranslatable words and concepts. In so doing, she revealed her sensitivity to political

necessity, recognizing the endurance of the written word and manipulating it to her ends, and engaging American historical understandings without capitulating to them.[52]

There is, therefore, both justification and precedent for writing Hawaiian history in English to further a decolonial agenda, but to do so effectively requires sensitivity to cultural context, and appreciation that meaning exists beyond the written word. Noelani Arista believes in the possible "integration of the methodological and intellectual practices of both Hawaiian and American histories," but argues that, in order to fully achieve this aim, historians must have the linguistic and cultural fluency to undertake both "close-reading" and "close-hearing" of the archive.[53] They should recognize the mobility between orality and text, and the words or phrases in written documents which suggest the importance of speech and performance to Native Hawaiians.[54]

Accordingly, scholars claiming to give voice to Native Hawaiian historical perspectives assure readers of their sensitivity by candidly and critically describing their own subject positions. Wood, Rohrer, and Gregory Rosenthal are examples of American *haole* scholars seeking to, in Wood's words, "embrace some methods for subverting the colonizing work" of their academic discipline, while acknowledging the limits of their comprehension.[55] Wood describes his struggle to give voice to Native Hawaiians while also "find[ing] a way to keep from seeming to present myself as yet another haole…expert."[56] Rohrer, meanwhile, as the daughter of a white hippie father who moved to the islands from California in the 1970s, seeks strategies for "doing haole differently." While not wanting to turn her work into a confessional, she believes that ignorance of her own subjectivity would represent complicity with the dispossession of Native Hawaiians and perpetuate the fiction that non-natives can study Hawai‘i objectively.[57] She writes that the key to effective understanding is to acknowledge that though "there are indigenous ways of knowing the Pacific that are not accessible to

those of us who are nonnative," and while she will make "political mistakes," scholars wishing to assist in decolonization "must educate ourselves about what we can know…and work collaboratively to build new knowledge and imagine just futures."[58] Rosenthal agrees, arguing that an external perspective comes with both the privilege of being able "to imagine creative and alternative interpretations to dominant discourses" and the responsibility to "pay witness to the historic and contemporary wrongs…committed…by academics and by others."[59]

It is not only non-native scholars who feel the need to justify the grounds upon which they are converting the *mo'olelo* (history) of Native Hawaiians into English-language scholarship. Jonathan Osorio, in the preface to *Dismembering Lāhui* (2002), acknowledges that there are legitimate doubts as to whether "Western historiography offers anything usable at all to Native peoples," but insofar as it does, he seeks to "reveal whatever sense of the past can possibly be shared by colonizer and colonized."[60] Chang, too, identifies as Native Hawaiian but was born outside the islands, and on this basis expresses his "deep humility and sincere hope that…my training in U.S. history and indigenous studies position me to make a useful contribution."[61]

Recentering Native Hawaiians

Once the need for context and sensitivity has been appreciated, there is innovative work to be done recentering Native Hawaiians within nineteenth-century history, overturning "the central narrative of American domination as inevitable and justified," and speaking to American historiography while rejecting many of its assumptions.[62] Chang's recent book *The World and All the Things Upon It* (2016) overturns ideas that indigenous people were passive objects of global exploration by analyzing Hawaiian understandings of geography. Chang demonstrates that Native Hawaiians had both the

curiosity and the ability to engage with the world outside of the islands and to comprehend their place within it, as is evident in their songs and stories.[63] Traditional narratives connect Hawai‘i to other Pacific islands through the movement of gods and ancestors between specific and identifiable places, unveiling a world of historical oceanic mobility.[64] Hawaiian knowledge of the world was perspectival, understanding the positioning of other places relative to Hawai‘i, rather than through abstract maps.[65]

Chang taps into a broader literature which reclaims a view of the Pacific as understood by its islanders, rather than from the "Pacific Rim."[66] Epeli Hau‘ofa, a Fijian anthropologist of Tongan descent, conceives of the Pacific as a "sea of islands." Rather than characterizing the many islands of the ocean as small, isolated, and impoverished, Hau‘ofa focuses on the sea as a place of mobility, which has served throughout Pacific history not to separate islands but to connect them.[67] This does not mean seeing the ocean as entirely interconnected, but as what Matt Matsuda calls a "multilocal space," within which islanders make worlds through particular patterns of interaction.[68]

Rohrer writes that, indeed, Hawaiians orient themselves towards a Pacific world defined by the "constant, disruptive, erosive presence of the ocean," which defies claims to ownership.[69] In emphasizing this fact, scholars push against the discursive construction of an "American Pacific," indicative of an "imperialist imaginary": in John Eperjesi's words, "a particular representation, or misrepresentation, of geographical space [which] supports the expansion of the nation's political and economic borders."[70] Such a construct takes a space of conflict and makes it appear natural, naming "a will to geographical domination and control" and providing a framework for an American form of Orientalism by setting the parameters of a "commercially valuable, spiritually satisfying, and geographically unified, region."[71] It gives rise to perceptions of an ocean which seamlessly connects America to Asia, reducing the islands in between to stepping

stones, sites of both strategic importance and romantic fantasy.[72] Nonetheless, this is an idea which some American historians, for example Arthur Dudden and Bruce Cumings, implicitly accept, and which it has taken the work of literary critics, including Eperjesi, Paul Lyons, and Rob Wilson, to deconstruct.[73] Kealani Cook has moreover suggested that even Hawaiian historians have imbibed something of this perspective, arguing in his study of nineteenth-century connections between Hawaiians and other Pacific peoples that a desire to counter apologists for U.S. empire has led to an overwhelming focus on Native Hawaiian engagements with U.S. imperialism, at the expense of considering Hawaiian ties to other parts of the world.[74]

Cook, Chang, and also Rosenthal, who considers how a nineteenth-century "Hawaiian Pacific World" was created through the movement of indigenous laborers engaging in a global capitalist economy, therefore seek a new orientation.[75] By eschewing assumptions that Hawai‘i is part of an "American Pacific," and instead using Hawaiian tradition and understandings of a connected Polynesian world to lay the foundations of his argument, Chang contextualizes the nineteenth-century written sources he uses as demonstrating an ongoing Native Hawaiian fascination with geography and reasserting Hawaiian agency within familiar nineteenth-century episodes. He shows that Cook's landing in 1778 did not so much reveal an outside world to Native Hawaiians as reinitiate contacts with a world much thought about, and encourage new travels for the purposes of acquiring knowledge.[76] He also emphasizes that connections between Hawai‘i and the United States were not defined solely through American agency, as Hawaiians imagined and centered themselves relative to America. Hawaiian intermediaries in the production of atlases ensured that the islands, rather than Europe and America, were centered; Kamanamaikalani Beamer and T. Ka‘eo Duarte similarly show how Native Hawaiians appropriated mapping to preserve traditional

place names and boundaries.[77] Moreover, Hawaiian laborers found their way to the United States and took their place "with the racialized and…indigenous," coupling with Native American women in California and living within African-American communities on the East Coast, thus demonstrating that racial identity was "not just the imposition of a racist order from the outside world."[78] Hawaiians came to understand the similarities between Native Americans' experience of dispossession and depopulation and their own, in ways which Chang believes were crucial in formulating consciousness of a global indigenous experience.[79]

Hawaiian acceptance of Christianity, too, figures in Chang's story not as an American imposition, but as the result of active indigenous engagement with outsiders. Chang reframes the story of ʻŌpūkahaʻia, the Hawaiian who converted to Christianity after having found his way to New England in the early nineteenth century, and who played a significant role in inspiring an American mission to the islands. ʻŌpūkahaʻia usually appears in American writing as an orphan who accidentally found his way to the East Coast and was taken in for conversion and education by sympathetic evangelicals. In Chang's book, however, he is an indigenous religious expert who actively engaged in the fur trade, seeking new sources of religious authority.[80] Beyond this, Chang emphasizes the agency of Tahitian converts in establishing Hawaiian Christianity, deemphasizing American missionaries, who were floundering until help arrived from those with whom Native Hawaiians already shared "layer upon layer of ties," and who came from a place already understood within Hawaiian tradition to be the source of religious innovation.[81] After their conversions, Hawaiians came to imagine themselves at the center of a sacred geography, drawing on traditional ideas about the sacralized Hawaiian landscape while also incorporating colonialist geographies of spiritual power, whereby it became Hawaiians' responsibility to evangelize neighboring island groups.[82]

Ultimately, Hawaiians "sincerely but strategically" made room for Christianity in ways consonant with their understandings of the world.[83]

Reconceptualization of Native Hawaiians' acceptance of Christianity is a theme in other work, too. Even Daws noted that religious choice was a mode through which Hawaiians expressed agency and resistance, for example switching their allegiance to Catholicism or Mormonism in the late nineteenth century as Protestantism became associated with the *haole* elite.[84] Anglicanism, too, shows Silva, became a mode through which Hawaiian monarchs asserted independence of thought, and in particular the Church of England provided a model for closer ties between church and state.[85] Recent studies have added yet more nuance. Ronald Williams, for example, considers how Native Hawaiian opposition to American hegemony could be expressed in sincere Protestant terms, despite the association of loyalty to the monarchy with heathenism which proponents of the overthrow sought to establish.[86] At the same time, Cook demonstrates that Hawaiians' relationship to traditional society was not unchanged by conversion: those who adopted the Congregationalism of American missionaries looked towards a radically different Hawaiian future, dissociated from the islands' past and from other Pacific peoples, even as many of their fellow Native Hawaiians looked to reclaim and perpetuate pre-contact lifeways and connections across the ocean.[87]

The most difficult thing for scholars attempting to recenter Native Hawaiians in nineteenth-century history to come to terms with is the apparent complicity of the Hawaiian monarchy in some of the devastating transformations which came to the islands. In other words, making the case that Hawaiian history is not synonymous with American history means asking difficult questions about Hawaiians' role in the erosion of their own world. Why, for example, did Liholiho, Ka'ahumanu, and Keōpūolani break the *'ai kapu*, allowing space for Christian missionaries who denigrated Native

Hawaiian ways of life? How far were Hawaiian elites complicit in the exploitation of the islands' resources and labor when foreigners came to take Hawai'i's sandalwood?[88] Why did Kauikeaouli instigate the Māhele, the legislation most destructive to the traditional relationship between Native Hawaiians and the land?

Scholars have answered these questions by reconsidering monarchs not as puppets or facilitators of American influence, but as doing their utmost to preserve Hawaiian independence in a changing Pacific world. Kame'eleihiwa argues that breaking the *'ai kapu* was a response to depopulation consonant with Hawaiian cosmology – mass death showed that the relationship between Native Hawaiians and their *akua* (gods) had broken down, and suggested the need for a new spiritual order.[89] From that point, Hawaiians perceived that missionaries might offer them eternal life, and their conversion to Christianity in turn explains the Māhele – missionaries' insistence that salvation was contingent upon Hawaiians' acceptance of Western customs led to the conclusion that "the world could not be *pono* [in equilibrium] without private ownership of *'Āina* [land]."[90] Osorio meanwhile explains Kauikeaouli's enaction of the Māhele in terms of the king's ability to recognize and respond to crisis, suggesting that he was working from entirely different principles to his missionary advisers. Under the immense pressures of ongoing depopulation, the weakening of traditional systems of land tenure, and the threat of external powers to his kingdom's sovereignty, Kauikeaouli accepted a solution which he thought would provide a way of managing lands which were increasingly empty of people, and of securing the loyalty of foreigners to the monarchy.[91]

More broadly, Silva argues that the creation of a nation and the accommodation of political and economic systems recognizable to Europeans and Americans were necessary to ensure survival within the international community, even if those same

forms ultimately eroded Hawaiian sovereignty.[92] This idea is drawn out in Kamanamaikalani Beamer's book *No Mākou Ka Mana* (2014), which emphasizes the agency of Hawaiian monarchs and their ability "to draw from their knowledge of the Hawaiian and Euro-American world" in order to "resist colonialism and…protect Native Hawaiian and national interests."[93] Beamer, however, pushes back against the idea that the monarchs paved the way for the end of Native Hawaiian sovereignty through their "selective appropriation" of European and American political and legal forms.[94] He instead underlines the successes of the Hawaiian Kingdom in maintaining its independence and ensuring fundamental continuity by modifying traditional modes of governance, and argues that the most significant effects of colonialism were only seen after the overthrow, which in itself was not "causally connected to…acceptance of law as defined by Europeans," but rather "was *unlawful*."[95] Beamer therefore points to a nineteenth-century history driven by Native Hawaiian agency, bringing in American agency only after 1893.

Similarly, Arista's sophisticated recent study of early nineteenth-century Hawai'i demonstrates both the viability of Native Hawaiian governance and the impact of a "confluence of worlds."[96] She focuses on *kapu* – oral legal pronouncements by Native Hawaiian chiefs. Even as missionaries caricatured Native Hawaiians in their writing for U.S. audiences, the foreigners who most successfully ingratiated themselves in the islands (notably the American missionary William Richards) understood the primacy of *kapu*, the importance of speech, and the authority of the chiefs.[97] Different "worlds of words" coalesced as Europeans and Americans, to whom writing was paramount, entered the islands.[98] Accordingly, to keep unruly foreign sailors and traders under their authority, Native Hawaiian monarchs adopted written laws.[99] Yet for Native Hawaiians, written proclamations only had force because they originated as spoken

kapu.[100] Though the increasing use of writing in Hawaiian law and governance led to a system which was "not as reactive to immediate conditions of context" as the *kapu*, its initial adoption was entirely consonant with past practices of chiefly deliberation and proclamation, and speaks of Native Hawaiian ingenuity and authority rather than colonial imposition.[101]

After establishing Hawaiian agency and resistance and resituating Hawai‘i within a broader Pacific world, nineteenth-century Hawaiian historiography also has to ensure that it does not become isolated from twentieth-century histories. Kuykendall and Daws created the impression that, even if Hawai‘i was not American before 1898, it certainly was afterwards, feeding into what Eperjesi identifies as a twentieth-century U.S. perception that Hawai‘i was a *fait accompli*.[102] Subsequent to annexation, it seemed, Hawai‘i's transformation into a safe space for American business and tourism, or an "imagined U.S. frontier," in Jeffrey Geiger's words, was rapidly completed.[103] By renaming locations and selectively appropriating elements of Hawaiian culture, Americans swiftly rewrote the significance of Hawaiian places, objects, and traditions and obscured the history of colonization.[104] Moreover, the indigenous population appeared to have been rendered marginal by the migration in huge numbers of Asian plantation workers. The importation of workers commenced in the mid-nineteenth century, but after annexation these laborers increasingly came to call Hawai‘i home, settling permanently and paving the way for statehood in 1959, as Americans sought a physical and cultural "bridge to Asia."[105] To read Lawrence Fuchs's *Hawaii Pono* (1961) or Ronald Takaki's *Pau Hana* (1983), it would appear to be the story of Asian migrants which transcended the 1898 moment, and not that of Native Hawaiians.[106]

It has therefore been important for nineteenth-century Hawaiian historians to connect their findings to twentieth-century and contemporary stories, situating their

work within a broader project to resist ongoing U.S. colonialism and to make Native Hawaiian voices heard. Because, Silva argues, "historiography is one of the most powerful discourses that justifies the continued occupation of Hawai'i by the United States today," it is also a key battleground for contesting that occupation.[107] Indeed, writes Kame'eleihiwa, the idea that Hawaiians should not lose sight of the past when engaging colonialism in the present is intrinsic to Native Hawaiian cosmology: the past is referred to as "the time in front," and the future as "the time which comes after," and therefore "it is as if the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers for present-day dilemmas."[108] Such an orientation, argues Rohrer, differentiates the Hawaiian perspective from that of Americans, who insist that colonization is just something that happened a long time ago.[109]

Accordingly, Chang, despite focusing on the nineteenth century, claims that part of his purpose is to uncover Hawaiian resistance to colonialism after 1898, and to speak to Native Hawaiians resisting American domination in the present.[110] His epilogue shows that efforts to center Native Hawaiians within global geographies persisted even in the face of heightened American control in the early twentieth century, and suggests that Hawaiians might continue to pursue similar strategies to contest American representations.[111] For Imada, meanwhile, nineteenth-century history provides an important backdrop to her study of contemporary hula dancers: the political and genealogical usages of the hula, especially by Kalākaua, indicate the dance's radical potential in the present.[112] Kauanui argues that the Māhele provides a critical background to ongoing debates about Native Hawaiian entitlement to land, while Beamer hopes that, by stressing the agency of Hawaiian chiefs in driving nineteenth-century history, he might help reawaken "a Hawaiian national consciousness":

"Witnessing what our ancestors were able to do against such overwhelming odds should help to defeat the seeds of self-doubt that have afflicted our people."[113] Finally, Rosenthal argues that the story of a nineteenth-century indigenous working class which shaped a Pacific world demonstrates the potency which Hawaiian masses would still have if they rose against colonial occupation.[114]

In sum, Hawaiian historiography strikes a delicate balance. On the one hand, it engages U.S. history and critiques egregious American settler colonial practice of which most Americans continue to be ignorant, even in the wake of Congress's 1993 apology to Native Hawaiians.[115] Hawaiian scholars stress that the overthrow of the indigenous monarchy and annexation were blatantly colonial actions, representing the culmination of a nineteenth-century story in which traditional ways of life were eroded by disease, Christianity, and foreign legal frameworks.[116] Hawaiian statehood in 1959 was not decolonization, but an outgrowth of these colonial actions – true independence for Native Hawaiians was never on the table.[117] On the other hand, the same historiography shows that Hawaiians resisted colonial processes, and are not mere ciphers within an American history. Colonialism did not affect all Native Hawaiians in the same way, and they did not always agree upon how to resist it, but fundamentally they were agents trying to reframe and defend their traditional understandings as the world transformed around them, and to assert their sovereignty in languages of both indigeneity and modern nationhood.[118] They deftly utilized print, Christianity, and foreign legal and political frameworks, demonstrating that colonial processes are not "unidirectional and totalizing."[119] Native Hawaiians ended up as victims of U.S. colonialism, and suffered great losses, but they were by no means silent, static, or passive.[120]

Hawaiian history and American history: towards a more productive dialogue

What, then, should nineteenth-century American historians learn from Hawaiian historiography? How can Hawai‘i show them something new about the United States, without being taken as essentially American? Literature on American empire has often simply bracketed Hawai‘i with the United States' island acquisitions of 1898. Richard Drinnon, for example, in *Facing West* (1980) sums up in a single sentence how "in 1898 the United States booted Spain out of the Caribbean, took Puerto Rico, grabbed the Philippines, annexed the Hawaiian Islands," without offering any detailed analysis of the Hawaiian case.[121] Richard Immerman, too, argues that the United States established itself as a great power in 1898 "by annexing Hawaii, conquering Spain's colony of the Philippines, establishing a protectorate in Cuba, acquiring sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone…and more."[122] In Walter LaFeber's formulation, meanwhile, echoed by Julian Go, Hawai‘i was a stepping stone for the development of American commercial interests across the Pacific.[123] Most important to these historians are the continuities which mark U.S. imperialism across the continent and into the Pacific; they react against an exceptionalist narrative which holds that the United States was never an imperial power.[124] As such, they risk leaving little room for Hawaiian voices or the specificity of the Hawaiian case.

If anything marks Hawai‘i out within these studies, it is not the perspective of its indigenous people but the fact that it was a white settler colony readied for annexation by American missionaries and planters.[125] American historians have often analyzed Hawai‘i through the lens of missionaries, those most responsible for putting the islands on the American radar. The Hawaiian mission stands out among nineteenth-century American evangelistic efforts. Firstly, it was, at least superficially, marked by overwhelming success, and by the fact that, in the words of Emily Conroy-Krutz, "the people…seemed to want [the missionaries] there."[126] Secondly, it was peculiarly and

inextricably linked to a formal American imperial project, as missionaries and their descendants formed the base of a settler community – a "missionary gang," in Trask's words – which ultimately overthrew the monarchy and lobbied for annexation.[127]

Unsurprisingly, therefore, missionaries are the villains of the piece in Hawaiian historiography. Trask claims that they "introduced a religious imperialism that was as devastating a scourge as any venereal pox."[128] Wood adds that the introduction of a "monorhetorical Jehovah, an akua who denied the reality of all other akua," was a critical element of the denigration of traditional Native Hawaiian thought by missionaries.[129] He calls missionaries "extremist[s]" who promulgated a "rhetoric of revulsion" about Native Hawaiians, transmuted into a racial hierarchy by their children and grandchildren.[130] These missionary descendants draw particular criticism from Hawaiian historians for their attempts to appropriate a Hawaiian identity, and to imply that they had as much of a claim to the islands through their birth as the indigenous population.[131]

In American scholarship, Silva points out, there has been less straightforward condemnation of the missionaries, but the Hawaiian mission has offered a lens through which to view a number of key historical themes.[132] Seth Archer, for example, uses missionary physicians to think about health and disease, viewing them as actors who ostensibly sought to reverse the trend of Hawaiian depopulation, but who, in their myopic obsession with alleged Hawaiian immorality and the supposed inevitability of indigenous death, failed to understand or solve the problems which actually faced the Hawaiian people.[133] This fits into Archer's broader argument that health constituted the defining crisis of nineteenth-century Hawai'i: disease and depopulation were not "bit players in a cast of colonial disruptions" but "colonial disruptions of the first order," connected to an array of cultural transformations and important in shaping Native

Hawaiian understandings of themselves in relation to foreigners.[134] Other historians have drawn out links between mission and empire: Jennifer Kashay simply states that missionaries were "agents of imperialism," albeit of a different form to that of merchants – their fellow New Englanders – while Conroy-Krutz identifies in Hawai'i the prime example of a settler style of mission trialed in the early nineteenth century, emblematic of a "Christian imperialism."[135]

In the work of Patricia Grimshaw, meanwhile, the Hawaiian mission is a site for the consideration of gender. Grimshaw shows that mission history involves "two careers, two life experiences, two centers of influence," despite the prevalence of missionary men in the historical literature, and that women in the mission were more than just wives, though they had to marry male missionaries in order to travel.[136] They pursued their own reformist ambitions, inspired by the Second Great Awakening, particularly centered on the uplift of Native Hawaiian women.[137] Jennifer Thigpen has built upon this work, arguing that, in Hawai'i, missionary wives became unexpectedly important cultural brokers: Americans were forced to adapt their methods and preconceptions, given the significant influence of Native Hawaiian women over religious matters in the islands.[138] Such Hawaiian women have received much attention both in contemporary sources and in the historiography of nineteenth-century Hawai'i, though Rosenthal questions whether the consequent effacement of Native Hawaiian men is itself a colonial assertion, rendering U.S. empire as the action of white masculinity upon a feminized nation.[139]

Finally, in a particularly detailed recent study of the Hawaiian mission, Joy Schulz considers the development of a colonial mentality among missionary children, arguing that "examining the lives of nineteenth-century white children born in Hawai'i provides a telling glimpse of why adults conquer nations."[140] Schulz shows how having

children in the islands led the original missionaries to pursue an economic agenda which they did not initially possess, setting the precedent for their acquisitive offspring.[141] The missionary children, meanwhile, through their childhood interactions with the Hawaiian landscape, their peer culture, and their ambivalent relationship to the United States developed a "bicultural identity" marked by both Hawaiian citizenship and a sense of supremacy based on their white American Protestant heritage.[142] Schulz almost rehabilitates the missionary children, arguing that they were themselves victims of their parents' colonial project, "the greatest natural resource to be harnessed and cultivated for the perpetuation of American evangelical authority."[143] She thus reaches some conclusions about them which do not chime with the assessments of Hawaiian scholars.

Schulz's study perhaps exemplifies the difficulties involved in balancing effective analysis of how American colonial power in Hawai'i was constructed with space for indigenous voices. In drawing out the nuances of the U.S. colonial enterprise from the American perspective, there is a danger of lapsing once again into showing how Americans acted upon Hawai'i, and rendering Native Hawaiians silent. Schulz is reflexive about this problem, acknowledging recent historiographical developments and questioning whether American missionary children should be placed within Hawaiian history, but nonetheless through her choice of sources leaves herself open to the criticism that she is writing another white history of the islands.[144] In first and foremost making claims about an American colonial mentality, albeit one arising from a peculiar set of circumstances, Schulz renders Hawaiian history subservient to American history.

Nonetheless, recent studies have, without a doubt, come a long way from Kuykendall and Daws, both in acknowledging and critiquing the colonial dimension of the Hawaiian story and in considering how Hawai'i's island world shaped American action, thought, and identity even as Americans sought dominance – Schulz and

Thigpen do this well. Such studies offer more nuanced perspectives on how Hawaiian and American histories intertwine, while accounting for the arguments emerging from Hawaiian historiography. Archer, for example, uses Hawaiian-language sources and pushes back against the "crude caricatures of Native life" which characterized previous American historiography, but also believes that Hawai'i offers us a way of thinking anew about "the boundaries – geographical and chronological – of colonial America and the early Republic." He argues that it is wrong that Hawai'i only becomes fully incorporated in U.S. history narratives from around the 1880s, and that to truly understand U.S. imperialism we must take into account Hawai'i's bearing upon America's commerce from the founding of the nation, its evangelicalism from the 1810s, and its geopolitics from the 1840s.[145]

Assertions of Hawaiian agency have also found their way into American scholarship. As early as 2000, Merry's *Colonizing Hawai'i* emphasized that the erosion of Hawaiian sovereignty through the introduction of foreign legal systems from the mid-nineteenth century was a drastic process, but not the result of a unilateral imposition, rather emerging from Hawaiian elites' struggle to retain independence in the face of imperial and commercial pressures.[146] Kashay similarly considers Hawaiian leaders' adoption of Christianity as a political strategy, while Walter Hixson draws on a number of insights from Hawaiian historiography when using Hawai'i as a case study for examination of American settler colonial practice.[147] He acknowledges Silva's comments on the "myth of nonresistance," highlights the ongoing struggle of Native Hawaiians into the twenty-first century, and considers how acceptance of Christianity, foreign legal systems, European-style clothing, and land reform were all strategies, albeit ultimately misguided, to preserve Hawaiian sovereignty.[148] A. G. Hopkins, in his recent reimagining of U.S. empire from a global perspective, also points to new ways

forward for American scholarship as it relates to Hawai‘i, by including in his overview details of pre-contact Hawaiian society, nineteenth-century monarchical agency, and ongoing resistance, and also by arguing for the unusual place of Hawai‘i within the American empire, which he believes deserves attention rarely accorded by scholars.[149]

Hawaiian scholars, too, have suggested ways towards a more effective integration of Hawaiian and American histories, showing how Hawai‘i offers new perspectives on key themes in U.S. history if we take seriously Hawaiian sources and viewpoints.[150] Chang points out that nineteenth-century Hawai‘i presents significant advantages over study of the continental United States when thinking about indigeneity, because of Native Hawaiians' extensive mobility across the Pacific world and because of the existence of documentation outlining their understandings.[151] Along similar lines, Rohrer argues that Hawai‘i nuances our comprehension of settler colonial practice: Native Hawaiians' conspicuousness and political awareness, in comparison with most places on the American continent, means that the islands provide "a unique location for developing more sophisticated understandings of multiple claims to place staked in complex relationships between indigeneity and race…that exceed native/settler binaries."[152] She also emphasizes that Hawai‘i shows us the kaleidoscopic and contingent nature of American ideas about race – an idea further elaborated by Kauanui.[153]

Perhaps most radically, Gary Okihiro's *Island World* (2008) suggests that thinking about how Hawai‘i "stirs and animates" the United States, and goes so far to view Hawai‘i as the "mainland," pushing the United States to the "periphery."[154] It does so not only by showing how ideas and cultural artefacts generated in Hawai‘i impacted the continental United States and demonstrating the movement of Native Hawaiians into America, but also by reconceptualizing time and space.[155] By deconstructing history's

"pieties" – linear time, discrete space, and human agency – Okihiro challenges us to think about "historical formations," and the worlds created from particular perspectives.[156] From Hawai'i, we perceive a world in which the distinction between islands and continents is meaningless, in which "fecund oceans convey…biotic communities, producing perpetual transgressions of bordered spaces," in which non-human aspects of the natural world have as much agency as humans, and in which causality is not synonymous with linearity.[157] Writing as an Asian American born in the islands, and aware of his own "vexed" relationship to the indigenous population, Okihiro sees his conceptualization as one which speaks to the present, empowering the sovereignty movement and pushing back against America's post-9/11 "new nationalism, empire, and world order."[158]

In sum, there are useful ways in which nineteenth-century American historians might seek to integrate Hawaiian history, but they must exercise caution in doing so. Hawai'i is not a footnote within U.S. history, an island group in which passive natives rolled over in the face of American imperial power. It is situated within a dynamic Pacific Ocean world, and its people effectively appropriated the trappings of nationhood and print culture to preserve their sovereignty and way of life across the nineteenth century, in the face of enormous tragedy and persistent denigration. Their struggle continues today in their activism and scholarly writing. The story that American historians must tell, therefore, is not one of unilateralism and inevitability, but of exchange, specificity, and contingency, which looks at least as much from the islands towards the United States as it does the other way round. This requires sensitivity not only to Hawaiian voices, but to the ways of thinking about time and space which characterize an "island world."

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Seth Archer and Henry Knight-Lozano for participating in the conference panel out of which the idea for this article and special issue emerged, and Silvana Siddali for chairing it. They would also like to thank the *ANCH* editors for their support in bringing the special issue together, the journal's anonymous reviewer for their recommendations, and Andrew Preston for his suggestion that a historiographical review such as this one would be a beneficial addition to the journal.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes

1. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 2.
2. Ibid., epigraph.
3. Teaiwa, "Reading Paul Gauguin's *Noa Noa*."
4. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 2.
5. Schulz, "Empire of the Young," 3-4; Thomas, *Islanders*, 26; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 23.
6. Schulz, "Empire of the Young," 9; Thomas, *Islanders*, 20.
7. Igler, *Great Ocean*, 41; Okihiro, *Island World*, 59; Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 6; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 126.
8. Okihiro, *Island World*, 59.
9. Archer, *Sharks Upon the Land*, 10.
10. Arista, *Kingdom and the Republic*, 86.
11. Schulz, "Empire of the Young," 4-5.
12. Banner, *Possessing the Pacific*, 138-139.
13. Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 75-76.
14. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 118-119.
15. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 7, 10.
16. Cook, *Return to Kahiki*, 13-18; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 47-48, 88-89.
17. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 201-205, 261.
18. Hopkins, *American Empire*, 421.
19. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 122.
20. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 12.
21. Ibid., 13-15.

22. Hopkins, *American Empire*, 426.
23. Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i*, 28.
24. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom*.
25. Daws, *Shoal of Time*.
26. Williams, "'Ike Mōakaaka," 69.
27. Kualapai, "Queen Writes Back," 41.
28. Chang, *World*, 27-28.
29. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 23.
30. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 291; Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 18; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 2.
31. Imada, *Aloha America*, 8-10.
32. Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i*, 25.
33. Cook, *Return to Kahiki*, 7.
34. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 114-115.
35. Ibid., 117, 120.
36. Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land*, 6, 19.
37. Smith, "Islanders," 71-72.
38. Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land*, 2; Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 12; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 5.
39. Smith, "Islanders," 80-82; Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 52.
40. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 11.
41. Ibid., 34.
42. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 2.
43. Ibid., 4-5, 89.
44. Ibid., 5, 144.
45. Brown, *Facing the Spears*; Silva, *Power*.
46. Finney et al, "Hawaiian Historians," 310-312.
47. Ibid., 308.
48. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 7; Schulz, *Hawaiian by Birth*, 11; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 137.
49. Nogelmeier, *Mai pa'a i ka leo*, xi-xiv, 25; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 15.
50. Nogelmeier, *Mai pa'a i ka leo*, 81, 96, 103-104; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 129-130.
51. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 15-17.
52. Kualapai, "Queen Writes Back," 47-55.
53. Arista, *Kingdom and the Republic*, 8, 86, 136.
54. Ibid., 12-15.
55. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 3.
56. Ibid., 5.
57. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 15-16.

58. Ibid., 16, 46-47.
59. Rosenthal, *Beyond Hawai‘i*, 12-13.
60. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, x.
61. Chang, *World*, xvi-xvii.
62. Aikau, *Chosen People*, 12.
63. Chang, *World*, 2-3.
64. Ibid., 13.
65. Ibid., 20-22.
66. Connery, “Pacific Rim Discourse”; Dirlik, *What is in a Rim?*.
67. Hau‘ofa, “Our Sea of Islands”; see Banner, *Possessing the Pacific*, 6; Diaz and Kauanui, “Native Pacific Cultural Studies”; Igler, *Great Ocean*, 10-11; Jolly, “Imagining Oceania”; Thomas, *Islanders*, 3-12.
68. Matsuda, “AHR Forum,” 758; Salesa, “Pacific in Indigenous Times,” 31-38, 44; Thomas, “Age of Empire,” 75.
69. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 15.
70. Eperjesi, *Imperialist Imaginary*, 2-4.
71. Ibid., 4, 14-15.
72. Ibid., 15-16.
73. Cumings, *Dominion*; Dudden, *American Pacific*; Lyons, *American Pacificism*; Wilson, *Reimagining the American Pacific*.
74. Cook, *Return to Kahiki*, 18-19.
75. Rosenthal, *Beyond Hawai‘i*, 1.
76. Chang, *World*, 6, 25-28.
77. Ibid., 121-122; Beamer and Duarte, “Mapping the Hawaiian Kingdom.”
78. Chang, *World*, 161.
79. Ibid., 228-229.
80. Ibid, 83-92.
81. Ibid., 92-97.
82. Ibid., 197, 224.
83. Ibid., 90.
84. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 292.
85. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 48.
86. Williams, “To Raise a Voice,” 3, 29.
87. Cook, *Return to Kahiki*, 4-7.
88. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 126.
89. Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Land*, 79-82.
90. Ibid., 13, 170.

91. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 44-49.
92. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 9, 15-16, 35-43, 170.
93. Beamer, *No Mākou Ka Mana*, 3-4.
94. Ibid., 152.
95. Ibid., 3, 15, 197.
96. Arista, *Kingdom and the Republic*, 3, 10.
97. Ibid., 52-53, 228.
98. Ibid., 4. 85.
99. Ibid., 8, 11, 137-139.
100. Ibid., 87, 178.
101. Ibid., 12, 175-176, 226.
102. Eperjesi, *Imperialist Imaginary*, 92.
103. Geiger, *Facing the Pacific*, 14.
104. Kanahele, *Waikīkī*; Lyons, *American Pacificism*, 27; Williams, "'Ike Mōakaaka," 70; Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 11-13, 45-49, 74-84, 93.
105. Miller-Davenport, *Gateway State*, 5.
106. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*; Takaki, *Pau Hana*.
107. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 9.
108. Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land*, 22.
109. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 35-36.
110. Chang, *World*, viii-ix.
111. Ibid., 249-252, 256-257.
112. Imada, *Aloha America*, 15-18, 43.
113. Beamer, *No Mākou Ka Mana*, 6, 230; Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 25-29, 75-80.
114. Rosenthal, *Beyond Hawai'i*, 4, 207.
115. Hixson, *American Settler Colonialism*, 199; Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 31; Kualapai, "Queen Writes Back," 58.
116. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 3, 9-13.
117. Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood,* 29.
118. Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*, 7; Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 6, 9; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 9.
119. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 23.
120. Chang, *World*, xi.
121. Drinnon, *Facing West*, 241.
122. Immerman, *Empire for Liberty*, 2.
123. Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 223; LaFeber, *New Empire*, viii, 408-410.
124. Go, *Patterns of Empire*, 54-55; Hixson, *American Settler Colonialism*, 145, 150-151, 167; LaFeber, *New Empire*, 416-417.

125. Drinnon, *Facing West*, 310-311.
126. Conroy-Krutz, *Christian Imperialism*, 39; Hutchison, *Errand to the World*, 62, 69-77.
127. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 12.
128. Ibid., 6.
129. Ibid., 136.
130. Wood, *Displacing Natives*, 37-39.
131. Ibid., 41.
132. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 30.
133. Archer, "Remedial Agents," 515-516.
134. Archer, *Sharks Upon the Land*, 2-6, 13.
135. Conroy-Krutz, *Christian Imperialism*, 104, 129; Kashay, "Agents of Imperialism."
136. Grimshaw, *Paths of Duty*, xix-xxi.
137. Ibid., xiii, xxi.
138. Thigpen, *Island Queens*, 1-2.
139. Rosenthal, *Beyond Hawai'i*, 5.
140. Schulz, *Hawaiian by Birth*, 12.
141. Ibid., 44.
142. Ibid., 146.
143. Ibid., 163.
144. Ibid., 10-11.
145. Archer, *Sharks Upon the Land*, 7, 9.
146. Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i*, 4, 13-14.
147. Kashay, "From *Kapus* to Christianity."
148. Hixson, *American Settler Colonialism*, 149, 151, 155-156, 185-186, 189-191.
149. Hopkins, *American Empire*, 417-418, 594-598.
150. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 14.
151. Chang, *World*, ix-x.
152. Rohrer, *Staking Claim*, 3.
153. Ibid., 5; Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 16-21.
154. Okihiro, *Island World*, 2, 5.
155. Ibid., 2.
156. Ibid., 4.
157. Ibid., 2-3.
158. Ibid., 4-5.

Bibliography

Aikau, Hokulani K. *A Chosen People, A Promised Land: Mormonism and Race in Hawai‘i*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Archer, Seth. “Remedial Agents: Missionary Physicians and the Depopulation of Hawai‘i.” *Pacific Historical Review* 79, No. 4 (2010): 513-544. doi: 10.1525/phr.2010.79.4.513.

Archer, Seth. *Sharks Upon the Land: Colonialism, Indigenous Health, and Culture in Hawai‘i, 1778-1855*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Arista, Noelani. *The Kingdom and the Republic: Sovereign Hawai‘i and the Early United States*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.

Banner, Stuart. *Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Beamer, Kamanamaikalani. *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Publishing, 2014.

Beamer, Kamanamaikalani and T. Ka‘eo Duarte, “Mapping the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Colonial Venture?” *Hawaiian Journal of Law & Politics* 2 (2006): 34-52.

Brown, Marie Alohalani. *Facing the Spears of Change: The Life and Legacy of John Papa ʻĪʻī*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2016.

Chang, David A. *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.

Connery, Christopher L. “Pacific Rim Discourse: The U.S. Global Imaginary in the Late Cold War Years.” In *Asia/Pacific as a Space of Cultural Production*, edited by Rob Wilson and Arif Dirlik, 30-56. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Conroy-Krutz, Emily. *Christian Imperialism: Converting the World in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.

Cook, Kealani. *Return to Kahiki: Native Hawaiians in Oceania*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Cumings, Bruce. *Dominion from Sea to Sea: Pacific Ascendancy and American Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1968.

Diaz, Vicente M. and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, “Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge.” *Contemporary Pacific* 13, No. 2 (2001): 315-342. doi: 10.1353/cp.2001.0049.

Dirlik, Arif, ed. *What is in a Rim? Critical Perspectives on the Pacific Region Idea*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993.

Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.

Dudden, Arthur Power. *The American Pacific: From the Old China Trade to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Eperjesi, John R. *The Imperialist Imaginary: Visions of Asia and the Pacific in American Culture*. Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Press, 2005.

Finney, Ben R., et al. “Hawaiian Historians and the First Pacific History Seminar.” In *The Changing Pacific: Essays in Honour of H. E. Maude*, edited by Niel Gunson, 308-335. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. *Hawaii Pono: A Social History*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.

Geiger, Jeffrey. *Facing the Pacific: Polynesia and the U.S. Imperial Imagination*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007.

Go, Julian. *Patterns of Empire: The British and American Empires, 1688 to the Present*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Grimshaw, Patricia. *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989.

Hau‘ofa, Epeli. “Our Sea of Islands.” *Contemporary Pacific* 6, No. 1 (1994): 147-161. doi: 10125/12960.

Hixson, Walter L. *American Settler Colonialism: A History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Hopkins, A. G. *American Empire: A Global History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.

Hutchison, William R. *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Igler, David. *The Great Ocean: Pacific Worlds from Captain Cook to the Gold Rush*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Imada, Adria L. *Aloha America: Hula Circuits Through the U.S. Empire*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.

Immerman, Richard H. *Empire for Liberty: A History of American Imperialism from Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Jolly, Margaret. “Imagining Oceania: Indigenous and Foreign Representations of a Sea of Islands.” *Contemporary Pacific* 19, No. 2 (2007): 508-545. doi: 10125/14024.

Kame‘eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea lā e Pono ai?*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.

Kanahele, George S. *Waikīkī, 100 B.C. to 1900 A.D.: An Untold Story*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1995.

Kashay, Jennifer Fish. “Agents of Imperialism: Missionaries and Merchants in Early-Nineteenth-Century Hawaii.” *New England Quarterly* 80, No. 2 (2007): 280-298. doi: 10.1162/tneq.2007.80.2.280.

Kashay, Jennifer Fish. “From *Kapus* to Christianity: The Disestablishment of Hawaiian Religion and Chiefly Appropriation of Calvinist Christianity.” *Western Historical Quarterly* 39, No. 1 (2008): 17-39. doi: 10.1093/whq/39.1.17.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.

Kualapai, Lydia. “The Queen Writes Back: Lili‘uokalani’s *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen*.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 17, No. 1 (2005): 32-62. doi: 10.1353/ail.2005.0053.

Kuykendall, Ralph Simpson. *The Hawaiian Kingdom*. 3 vols. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1938-1967.

LaFeber, Walter. *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion 1860-1898*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963.

Lyons, Paul. *American Pacificism: Oceania in the U.S. Imagination*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Matsuda, Matt K. “AHR Forum: The Pacific.” *American Historical Review* 111, No. 3 (2006): 758-780. doi: 10.1086/ahr.111.3.758.

Merry, Sally Engle. *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Miller-Davenport, Sarah. *Gateway State: Hawai‘i and the Cultural Transformation of American Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Nogelmeier, Marvin Puakea. *Mai pa‘a i ka leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2010.

Okihiro, Gary Y. *Island World: A History of Hawai‘i and the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.

Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002.

Rohrer, Judy. *Staking Claim: Settler Colonialism and Racialization in Hawai‘i*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016.

Rosenthal, Gregory. *Beyond Hawai‘i: Native Labor in the Pacific World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018.

Salesa, Damon. “The Pacific in Indigenous Times.” In *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land People*, edited by Alison Bashford and David Armitage, 31-52. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Schulz, Joy. “Empire of the Young: Missionary Children in Hawaii and the Birth of U.S. Colonialism in the Pacific.” PhD diss., University of Nebraska, 2011.

Schulz, Joy. *Hawaiian by Birth: Missionary Children, Bicultural Identity, and U.S. Colonialism in the Pacific*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2017.

Silva, Noenoe K. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Silva, Noenoe K. *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.

Smith, Tom. “Islanders, Protestant Missionaries, and Traditions Regarding the Past in Nineteenth-Century Polynesia.” *Historical Journal* 60, No. 1 (2017): 71-94. doi: 10.1017/S0018246X16000157.

Takaki, Ronald. *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii, 1835-1920*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1983.

Teaiwa, Teresia K. “Reading Paul Gauguin’s *Noa Noa* with Epeli Hau‘ofa’s *Kisses in the Nederends*: Militourism, Feminism, and the ‘Polynesian Body.’” *UTS Review* 5, No. 1 (1999): 53-69.

Thigpen, Jennifer. *Island Queens and Mission Wives: How Gender and Empire Remade Hawai‘i’s Pacific World*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Thomas, Nicholas. *Islanders: The Pacific in the Age of Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.

Thomas, Nicholas. “The Age of Empire in the Pacific.” In *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land People*, edited by Alison Bashford and David Armitage, 75-96. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i*. Revised ed. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999.

Williams Jr, Ronald C. “‘Ike Mōakaaka, Seeing a Path Forward: Historiography in Hawai‘i.” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 7 (2011): 67-90. doi: 10125/23569.

Williams Jr, Ronald C. “To Raise a Voice in Praise: The Revivalist Mission of John Henry Wise, 1889-1896.” *Hawaiian Journal of History* 46 (2012): 1-36. doi: 10524/33792.

Wilson, Rob. *Reimagining the American Pacific: From South Pacific to Bamboo Ridge and Beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000.

Wood, Houston. *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai‘i*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.